

REMARKS

In the Office Action, claims 1-8 and 24-31 were rejected under 35 USC section 102(b) as being anticipated by Dahl US patent 3,286,651. Claims 9-13 were rejected under 35 USC section 103(a) and as being unpatentable over Dahl. Claims 14 and 32-36 were rejected under 35 USC section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Baker US patent 3,867,868. Claims 15, 17-19 and 37 were rejected under 35 USC section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Baker in view of Hoska US patent 5,597,217. Claims 16, 20-23 and 38-41 were rejected under 35 USC section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Baker and Hoska, and further in view of Dahl.

Initially, Applicants note the Examiner's detailed explanations of the manner in which the references are interpreted to apply to the claimed subject matter. This degree of care and attention is noted with sincere appreciation.

By this response, claims 8, 12, 13, 17-19 and 24-41 are canceled. The remaining claims are amended in a manner believed to patentably define over the references.

Specifically, claim 1 is amended to call for a set of disassembled storage unit components. Claim 1 also calls for a wheel arrangement that is separate from the storage unit components, and a guide arrangement including at least one rail. The storage unit components, the wheel arrangement and the guide arrangement are defined as being contained within a kit in which the disassembled storage unit components, the wheel arrangement and a guide arrangement are packaged and transported together in the kit in a disassembled state to an installation site that includes a support surface. Claim 1 also states that the storage unit components are adapted to be assembled at the installation site to form a storage unit and that the wheel arrangement is configured to be engaged with the assembled storage unit after assembly of the storage unit.

The Dahl reference does not show or suggested the subject matter of amended claim 1. In this regard, the Dahl reference discloses a tub desk or file container 10 that is preassembled and is separate from the rails or tracks 28. There is absolutely no disclosure whatsoever in Dahl that the tub desk and the wheels are separate components that are disassembled and packaged together. In direct contrast, the wheels 16 in Dahl are secured to the container using a wheel support bracket engaged with a structural member of the container by means of a pin 22. Importantly, the pin 22 has a head that is

located in the interior of the container. The opposite end of the pin 22 is located adjacent the upper surface of the wheel 16. This construction makes it impossible for the wheels and the storage unit components to be separate components that are disassembled and packaged in kit form, and then assembled on site as claimed. This is also true with respect to the rail that is disclosed in Dahl. In Dahl, there is absolutely no showing or suggestion that the rail and the assembled container 10 are components that are disassembled and shipped together in kit form to an installation site.

The present invention provides a storage system in which all components, i.e. the storage unit components, the wheels and the rails are all in disassembled form, and are packaged and shipped together to an installation site. The Dahl reference does not show or suggest such a storage system, and for this reason claim 1 is believed to patentably define over Dahl.

Claims 2-7 depend directly or indirectly from claim 1, and are believed allowable for the above reasons as well as in view of the subject matter of each claim.

Claim 9 has been amended to emphasize distinctions of the wheel mounting arrangement of the present invention over the prior art. In this regard, claim 9 is amended to state that the wheel brackets are separate from and engageable with the lower corners of the storage units. Each wheel bracket it is defined as including a wheel and defining corner engagement structure that is configured to engage and receive one of the lower corners of the storage unit. The corner engagement structure of the wheel brackets is defined as being configured to engage the corners of the storage unit in either a first orientation or a second orientation to position the wheels in either a first direction or a second direction relative to the storage unit, to guide movement of the storage unit on the rails in either the first direction or the second direction.

The Dahl reference, which was relied upon in originally rejecting claim 9, does not show or suggest the claimed subject matter. As noted above, the Dahl reference does not show wheel assemblies that are separate from and engageable with a storage unit. Rather, the Dahl reference shows wheel brackets that are constructed together with the storage unit using pins 22. Furthermore, the Dahl reference does not show wheel assemblies that include corner engagement structure that is configured to engage lower corners of the storage unit in either a first orientation or a second orientation, to control

the position of the wheels, as claimed. In Dahl, the position of the wheels relative to the storage units is fixed.

For the above reasons, amended claim 9 is believed to patentably define over the Dahl reference. Claims 10 and 11 depend directly or indirectly from claim 9, and are thus also believed allowable for the above reasons as well as in view of the subject matter of each claim.


Claim 14 has been amended along the same lines as claim 9, and is believed allowable for the above reasons along with dependent claims 15, 16, and 20-22. Regarding the Baker reference, the wheel mounting members of Baker are an integral part of the frame of the storage unit, and are not separate wheel mounting members as claimed.

Claim 23 has been amended to independent form, and is directed to the alternative orientation of the wheel assemblies in combination with the stop structure that enables the forward wheels to be moved off the rails and onto the support surface, in combination with a wheel guide for moving the forward wheel members into engagement with the rail members when the storage unit is moved from the extended position to the retracted position. The combination of Baker, Hoska and Dahl contains no showing or suggestion of this feature.

Applicants' attorney has made every effort to place this application into condition for allowance with claims 1-7, 9-11, 14-16 and 20-23, and such action is earnestly requested.

The Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned by phone if questions remain after consideration of this response, or if such would otherwise facilitate prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Andrew S. McConnell
Reg. No. 32,272

Boyle Fredrickson, S.C.
840 North Plankinton Avenue
Milwaukee, WI 53203
(414) 225-9755
Customer No.: 23598